arXiv:astro-ph/9506060v1 8 Jun 1995

The Physics of Core-Collapse Supernova Explosions[a]

ADAM BURROWS AND JOHN HAYES

Departments of Physics and Astronomy
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

INTRODUCTION

Fresh insights and powerful numerical tools are revitalizing the theoretical exploration of the supernova mechanism. The realization that the protoneutron star is Rayleigh-Taylor unstable at various times and radii and, hence, that a multi-dimensional perspective is required is one agent of this revolution. However, a new physical understanding of the nature of explosions (even spherical explosions) that are driven by neutrino heating and that escape from deep within a gravitational potential well is also emerging.[1,2,3,4] This, together with the new multi-dimensional approach, promises to establish a new paradigm within which supernova explosions and their consequences can be studied in the future.

Supernova theory is in flux and a consistent model that fits the growing list of observational constraints does not yet exist. Nevertheless, the observed explosion energies, nickel yields, optical and IR line profiles, pulsar kicks, neutron star masses, nickel debris distributions, and nucleosynthesis are strengthening the connections between collapse theory and empirical astronomy. Two of the remaining embarrasments of theory concern the overproduction of neutron-rich species and the difficulty of achieving entropies sufficient to produce an r-process. However, recent simulations hint at how these problems can be solved.[2] In addition, the observation of high-speed pulsars suggests that asymmetries during and/or after core collapse might exist. Recent calculations by Bazan and Arnett[5] show that silicon- and oxygen-burning are hydrodynamic and that Mach-number and density variations in the core at collapse can be

[a]The authors would like to acknowledge the NSF both for support under grant # AST92-17322 and for the use of NSF Supercomputer Centers where much of the heavy lifting was performed.

high. These asymmetries can amplify during infall and can result in asymmetric explosions that blow preferentially via the paths of least resistance. Burrows and Hayes[6] have recently demonstrated, via a 180° 2-D hydrodynamic simulation, such a "rocket" effect. The asymmetrically ejected matter causes the residual core to recoil with speeds of hundreds of kilometers per second. (This suggests that magnetic field effects are not necessary to achieve high neutron star speeds.) In addition, there may be a correlation between the pulsar recoils and the distribution of the ejected ^{56}Ni.

There are far too many new and interesting questions, problems, and potential solutions to be comfortably contained in this short paper. Therefore, we will focus here on a discussion of the crucial ingredients of the explosion *mechanism* itself and the character of the blast after it starts. A more in-depth discussion of some of the constraints listed in Table 1 and the 1-D and 2-D hydrodynamic simulations that we have recently performed can be found in BHF[2]. Color figures from that paper and mpeg movies of one of its 2-D simulations can be acquired gratis via mosaic at URL address http://lepton.physics.arizona.edu:8000/.

NEUTRINO-DRIVEN EXPLOSIONS IN ONE AND TWO DIMENSIONS

a. The Quasi-Steady-State Phase Before Explosion and the Explosion Condition

After the "Chandrasekhar" core of a massive star becomes unstable to implosion, it evolves through various distinct hydrodynamic phases. These are infall, core bounce, shock formation, shock stagnation, the pre-explosion quasi-steady state, the onset of explosion, and the explosion proper. Twenty to one hundred milliseconds into the explosion, a distinct neutrino-driven wind emerges from the core, whatever the details of the mechanism. Since the direct hydrodynamic mechanism aborts for all progenitors (even the lightest massive stars), the nature and evolution of the quasi-steady state after the shock stalls takes on a new importance. How long does the steady-state phase last? What triggers the explosion? How does the explosion evolve? In what context does a black hole form? The answers to all these questions hinge on the proper understanding of the physics of the shock-bounded and accreting protoneutron star.

Burrows and Goshy (1993, BG)[1] have recently developed an approximate semi-analytic theory of such objects. Setting all partial derivatives with respect to time equal to zero, the equations of hydrodynamics and neutrino transfer become a set of coupled ordinary differential equations, subject to boundary conditions. Such a problem is an *eigenvalue* problem. With an equation of state, a prescription for the bounding shock jump conditions and the outer supersonic flow profiles, a given core mass (~ 1.1–$1.3 M_\odot$), and simple formulae for neutrino heating and cooling exterior to the neutrinospheres, BG[1] solved

for the steady-state structure. The shock radius (R_s) was the eigenvalue and the electron neutrino luminosity (L_{ν_e}) and the mass accretion rate ($\dot{M}$) were the control parameters. Physically, the structure adjusts until the infall time from the shock to the core ($\frac{R_s}{u_1}$, where u_1 is the post-shock settling velocity) is "equal" to the cooling or heating timescale. This equality of timescales is similar to the equality of the free-fall and sound travel times in the context of hydrostatic equilibrium and to a similar condition in the context of AM Her stand-off shocks.[7,8] The quasi-steady assumption is proper as long as these adjustment timescales ($\sim$10 milliseconds) are shorter than the timescale for the decay of $\dot{M}$ (30-100 milliseconds). Note that the radius to which the bounce shock is initially thrown is almost unrelated to its later steady values.

Increasing L_{ν_e} for a given $\dot{M}$, increases R_s (roughly as $L^2_{\nu_e}/\dot{M}$). However, this behavior does not continue for arbitrarily high L_{ν_e}. BG[1] showed that for each $\dot{M}$ (and set of model assumptions), there is a *critical* L_{ν_e} above which there is no steady-state protoneutron star envelope (Figure 1). This is reached at a finite value of the eignevalue, R_s (generally less than 200 kilometers). BG[1] identified the implied *instability* with the onset of the supernova explosion. This onset is a critical phenomenon and is at the bifurcation between steady-state and wind solutions of the equations. If, for a given $\dot{M}$, L_{ν_e} could be increased by better neutrino transport or cross sections or by convective enhancement,[9,10] the 1-D models would explode more readily. The problem with previous 1-D calculations is that their L_{ν_e}–$\dot{M}$ trajectories passed below the critical curve, as Figure 1 depicts.

Recently, it was shown that the outer shocked envelopes of the protoneutron star are generically unstable to Rayleigh-Taylor overturn driven by neutrino heating from below.[11,12,13,2,14] This and other hydrodynamic instabilities before, during, and after explosion are redrawing our picture of the evolution and character of supernova blasts. An important question one may ask is: how do the multi-dimensional effects alter the explosion mechanism? On this there is much needless confusion that the next paragraphs may partially clear up.

Figure 2 depicts in cartoon form the shock-bounded protoneutron star before explosion in 1-D and $\geq$2-D. Relaxing spherical symmetry allows some parcels of matter that have just passed through the shock and that are being heated by neutrinos from the core to rise like balloons or cells in any "convectively" unstable region. This allows the matter to dwell longer in the gain region (where heating $>$ cooling) and, hence, to achieve higher entropies than is possible in 1-D.[11,13]

FIGURE 1. Approximate critical curves for explosion, with and without multi-dimensional effects, in L_{ν_e} versus $\dot{M}$ space. Superposed is a representative L_{ν_e} vs. $\dot{M}$ trajectory for a realistic calculation. Note that this curve intersects the lower $\geq$ 2-D critical curve at some time, whereas in 1-D it may never.

FIGURE 2. Schematics of the accreting protoneutron star in 1- and $\geq$2-dimensions. The gain region is indicated by the hatches. The main difference between the two is the larger steady-state radius that overturn allows.

In 1-D, the heated parcel would perforce fall directly into the cooling region interior to the gain radius (where cooling = heating) and lose its just recently gained energy. (Curiously, the cooling region lies closer to the neutrinospheres where the temperatures are higher.)

However, the rising balloons, upon encountering the shock, are immediately advected inward by the powerful mass accretion flux raining down. They do not dwell near the shock. In fact, the net mass flux through the shock is approximately equal to the mass flux onto the core and mass does not accumulate in the convective zone. The mass between the shock and the neutrinospheres *decreased* by about a factor of three in the calculations of BHF[2] during the pre-explosion boiling phase that lasted $\sim$100 milliseconds ($\sim$30 convective turnover times). *All* the matter that participates in the "convection" before explosion eventually leaves the convection zone and settles onto the core. A given parcel of matter may "cycle" one or two times before settling inward (and a large fraction never rises), but more than three times is rare. The boiling zone is resupplied with mass by mass accretion through the shock and a secularly evolving steady-state is reached. This steady-state is similar to that achieved in 1-D, but due to the higher dwell time the average entropy in the envelope is larger and its entropy gradient is flatter. These effects, together with the

dynamical pressure of the buoyant plumes, serve to increase the steady-state shock radius over its value in 1-D by 30%–100%. It is this effect of boiling that is central to its role in triggering the explosion, for it thereby lowers the critical luminosity threshold. As Figure 1 suggests, the lowering of the effective critical curve allows the actual model trajectory in L_{ν_e} vs. $\dot{M}$ space to intersect it. Even if in 1-D it can be shown that the two curves can intersect, they would intersect earlier and more assuredly with the multi-dimensional effects included. The physical reasons for the lowered threshold are straightforward: a large R_s enlarges the volume of the gain region, puts shocked matter lower in the gravitational potential well, and lowers the accretion ram pressure at the shock for a given $\dot{M}$. Since the "escape" temperature ($T_{\rm esc} \propto \frac{GM\mu}{kR}$) decreases with radius faster than the actual matter temperature (T) behind the shock, a larger R_s puts a larger fraction of the shocked material above its local escape temperature. $T > T_{\rm esc}$ is the condition for a thermally-driven corona to lift off of a star. In one, two, or three dimensions, since supernovae are driven by neutrino heating, they are coronal phenomena, akin to winds, though initially bounded by an accretion tamp. Neutrino radiation pressure is unimportant.

We conclude that the instability that leads to explosion in $\geq$2-D is of the same character as that which leads to explosion in 1-D. Since the explosion succeeds a quasi-steady-state phase, neither the total neutrino energy deposited during the boiling phase nor any putative coeval thermodynamic cycle is of relevance to the energy of the explosion or the trigger criterion. Energy does not accumulate in the overturning region before explosion (it in fact decreases) and the increasing vigor (speed) of convection is in response to the decay of $\dot{M}$. If $\dot{M}$ were held constant, the overturning would not grow more vigorous with every "cycle" and a simple, stable convective zone would be established. In fact, before explosion the average total energy fluxes ($(\epsilon + P/\rho + \frac{1}{2}v^2 - \frac{GM}{r})\dot{M}$) due to the overturning motions are *inward*, not outward, since the net direction of the matter is onto the core. Figure 3 depicts such fluxes versus radius at various times for the 1-D and 2-D simulations conducted by BHF[2] of the core of a $15M_\odot$ star. The hump on the inside mirrors the corresponding plot for the total neutrino luminosities. During the boiling phase, the net fluxes in the gain region are negative, not positive, and they become positive only after the explosion commences. This interpretation of the role of 2-D and the nature of supernova explosions differs from that of HBC[11] and HBHFC[12].

b. The Explosion

Importantly, just after the explosion criterion is achieved, the explosion energy is still not determined. In fact, the matter that will eventually be ejected is often still *bound*, even correcting for the reassociation boost (the "afterburner"). This fact emphasizes that the explosion condition has nothing to do with the aggregate neutrino deposition before explosion and that this aggregate heating has nothing to do with the explosion energy itself. The onset of

explosion causes the shocked matter to expand and to lower its temperature, thereby turning off cooling. The expansion runs away because heating continues unchecked by cooling, whose integral had usually dominated between the neutrinosphere and the shock during the quasi-state phase. The explosion and the shock are thereafter *driven* by neutrino energy deposition. This continuing source is necessary so that the ejecta can eventually achieve positive energies of supernova magnitude. Soon after the explosion commences, all convective cycling between the shock and neutrinospheres ceases permanently. Note that it is only after the shock has achieved many thousands of kilometers that the explosion has had a chance to "feel" the mantle binding energy that it will eventually have to overcome to succeed. If this binding energy is large, the explosion will be slow. This will allow the material of the explosion to be heated longer. This feedback effect partially compensates for the variety of envelope binding energies along the massive star continuum,[2] and may explain why supernova energies are all near 10^{51} ergs. Binding energies of massive star envelopes are of order 10^{51} ergs because this is approximately the binding energy of a Chandrasekhar white dwarf ($\sim m_e c^2 \mathrm{N_A M_{CH}}$). (Simple arguments show that the envelope and the core binding energies are comparable). Therefore, and very crudely, the envelope binding energies set the scale of the explosion energy (to within a factor of three?), though we still can't say whether it increases or decreases with ZAMS mass. It is suspected that the envelope binding energies can be too high and that the accretion tamp can be too oppressive and that above some ZAMS mass, the core will collapse to a black hole before or during explosion. It is not known whether, during the first seconds after bounce, a supernova and a black hole are mutually exclusive results. (We know from its neutrino signal that in SN1987A the neutron star lasted at least 12.5 seconds.)

FIGURE 3. The angle-averaged total energy fluxes versus radius in the one- and two-dimensional calculations of BHF. The average position of the shock is identified with a circle. Note that the energy fluxes are not outward in 2-D, until the explosion begins.

DISCUSSION

Though we have made progress in understanding supernova explosions, we still don't know the interesting systematics as a function of progenitor mass. What are $E_{SN}(M_{\rm ZAMS})$, $M_{NS}(M_{\rm ZAMS})$, the critical mass for black hole formation, and the r-process and ^{56}Ni yields? In addition, all the 2-D explosion simulations to date eject too much neutron-rich matter. This problem may be solved if the delay to explosion ($\sim$50 milliseconds for HBHFC[12] and $\sim$100 milliseconds for BHF[2]) were longer still, allowing the envelope mass to decrease and the density of the accreting matter to thin. (The latter is important because electron-capture rates are stiffly increasing functions of density.) Thus far, no multi-dimensional explosion simulation has involved multi-group transport, general relativity, or been done in 3-D. We are only at the beginning of a new theoretical assault on the supernova phenomenon that will provide scores of research projects for this and the next generation of modelers.

REFERENCES

1. BURROWS, A., J. GOSHY. 1993. Ap. J. Lett. **416**:L75 (BG).

2. BURROWS, A., J. HAYES, AND B. A. FRYXELL. 1994. submitted to Ap. J. (BHF).

3. JANKA, H.-T., E. MÜLLER. 1993. In the proceedings of the Internat'l Symposium on Neutrino Astrophysics, held in Takayama/Kamioka Japan Oct. 19–22, 1992, to appear in *Frontiers of Neutrino Astrophysics*, (Universal Academy Press Inc. Tokyo, Japan).

4. JANKA, H. T., E. MÜLLER. 1994. A&A in press.

5. BAZAN, G., AND D. ARNETT. 1994. Ap. J. Lett. **433**:L41.

6. BURROWS, A., AND J. HAYES. 1995. in preparation.

7. CHEVALIER, R. A., AND J. N. IMAMURA. 1982. Ap. J. **261**:543.

8. LANGER, S. H., G. CHANMUGAM, AND G. SHAVIV. 1981. Ap. J. **245**:L23.

9. BURROWS, A. 1987. Ap. J. Lett. **318**:L57.

10. MAYLE, R., J. R. WILSON. 1988. Ap. J. **334**:909.

11. HERANT, M., W. BENZ. S. A. COLGATE. 1992. Ap. J. **395**:642 (HBC).

12. HERANT, M., W. BENZ, J. HIX, C. FRYER, AND S. A. COLGATE. 1994. Ap. J. **435**: 339 (HBHFC).

13. BETHE, H. 1990. Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**:801.

14. JANKA, H. T., E. MÜLLER. This volume.

arXiv:astro-ph/9506060v1 8 Jun 1995

Table 1
A Précis of Major Observational Constraints on Supernova Theory

1. Explosion energy ($\sim 1.5 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{51}$ ergs for '87A and '93J)
2. SN1987A Neutrino bursts ($< \overline{\epsilon}_{\nu_e} >\sim$12–15 MeV, $\Delta t \sim 10$ seconds, $E_{\overline{\nu}_e} \sim 5 \pm 1 \times 10^{52}$ ergs)
3. Masses of neutron stars in binary pulsar systems ($M_G \sim$1.32–1.45$M_\odot$)
4. Pulsar proper motions ($\langle v_t \rangle \sim$ 450km/s)
5. 56Ni yields ($M(^{56}Ni) \sim$0.05–0.1$M_\odot$)
6. High ^{56}Ni speeds in SN1987A ($v \lesssim$4000 km/s)
7. Bochum event in $H\alpha$ in SN1987A (interpreted with a high-speed ^{56}Ni bullet)
8. "Shrapnel" in supernova remnants (Vela, Cas A, N132D)
9. Asymmetrical ^{56}Ni debris distributions (in '87A, '93J ...)
10. Yields of $N = 50$ nuclei (^{88}Sr, ^{89}Y, ^{90}Zr)
11. $[\frac{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{Ne}}]$, $[\frac{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{Si}}]$, $[\frac{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{M}_g}]$ yields in halo stars
12. $\frac{\Delta Y}{\Delta Z}$ after galactic chemical evolution
13. The r-process (high entropies near $\sim$450 required?)
14. ^{57}Fe, ^{54}Fe, ^{58}Fe, ^{60,62}Ni yields
15. Silicon, Sulfur yields
16. Stellar mass black holes (A0620-00, Cyg X-1, V404, Nova Muscae, ...)